ANSWER

ON BEHALF OF THE RECTOR

TO THE STATEMENT OF THE

VESTRY OF CHRIST CHURCH,

GERMANTOWN.

As read before the Board of Presbyters,

February 29th, 1872.

PHILADELPHIA:
KING & BAIRD, PRINTERS, 607 SANSOM STREET.
1872.

ANSWER.

A Committee of the Vestry of Christ Church, Germantown, W. C. Houston, Charles Spencer, Joseph W. Lewis, and W. B. Whitney, appointed "to confer with the Rector on the well-being of the parish," have presented a statement to this Board of Presbyters alleging certain grounds of complaint against the Rector, and asking for a dissolution of the connection between the Rector and his congregation, under Canon 4, Title II. as amended, of the General Canons of the Protestant Episcopal Church. This action of the committee is endorsed by Thomas H. Powers, Charles Le Boutillier, A. Miskey, Jacob Clark, and William Mellor. These nine persons constitute a majority of the present Vestry.

The "statement" of the complainants is so weak, the failure even to make specific charges of default against the Rector such a conscious admission of inability to prove any default, and the grounds of discontent as stated are so explicitly partisan, that the respondent might well have been willing to have rested his case without even a reply. But the complainants have managed so thoroughly to entangle the facts that an answer seems to be imperative.

The substance of this "statement" may be summed up as follows:

1. That Christ Church, Germantown, was organized by certain persons in the interests of the "Low Church party," and that it owes allegiance not to the church at large but to the persons who contributed money to its erection.

2. That the Rev. Dr. Rumney was elected Rector, "unseen, unheard, unknown," upon the representations of certain members of the vestry, which representation betrayed the remaining vestrymen into voting for him.

3. That "a very short time served to show that Dr. Rumney was not 'an Evangelical man as we Low Churchmen understand it,' and that he was not willing to support those Evangelical societies which it had been the invariable practice of Christ Church to support. Clergymen filled the

pulpit under Dr. Rumney's auspices in his exchanges and occasional absences, who had never before addressed the congregation of Christ Church, and who were different entirely in their views from their dearly loved preachers. Innovations were introduced in the parish which were not approved by either the vestry or the pew holders."

4. That since Dr. Rumney's rectorship that "once flourishing parish" has been reduced to a "paralyzed condition," that the missionary spirit has died out, that the collections have decreased, that the free reading room has perished, that the congregation has dwindled down."

5. That the dissatisfaction with Dr. Rumney has "resulted from his own action and not from any fault of the parish," and that for fifteen years previous to his rectorship all was peace, harmony and success.

6. That the majority of the vestry in desiring a dissolution of the pastoral connection represents the congregation in the fullest possible manner.

I. As to the origin of the church organization.

The statement of the vestry begins with what is called a "narrative of the foundation of the church, prepared by one of the corporators, and acquiesced in by the surviving members of the original corporation." Of course the only impression conveyed to the reader by this is that *all* the surviving members concur. There is no exception or reservation. This narrative names Mr. P. E. Hamm as the originator of the church. Will it be believed then that the gentleman (not Mr. P. E. Hamm) who really originated the church, at whose house the first meetings were held; who started a flourishing Sunday school, and had regular church services for months before a vestry was thought of; who was superintendent of the Sunday school for three years; who invited the co-operation of the other gentlemen in forming a vestry; who drew the charter with his own hand; who was "one of the corporators," a member of the first vestry, secretary of the vestry for seventeen months, and for nineteen years an attendant at the church; and who to-day is alive and in good health; is not even recognized in this document as a survivor!

But Mr. Potter shall be allowed to speak for himself. His letter will be found in the appendix, and fully shows that most of the original incorporators had little more than a nominal connection with the parish, and that the lot on which the church was built was given solely at Mr. Potter's solicitation by a member of the Episcopal Church, who has never been a Low Churchman.

It will thus be seen that the corner stone of the "statement" has not been very accurately laid, and that the historian of Christ Church, who professes to be so "familiar with the causes which induced that organization," has proved himself to be, at least, a very incautious chronicler.

Another of the incorporators, Mr. C. W. Robinson, it will be noticed, is still surviving. His signature also does not appear at the conclusion of the "narrative."

Every one knows how readily signatures are obtained and how seldom documents are read by the signers. None are more surprised than those very signers frequently are at the uses to which their signatures are put. There is nothing in this narrative, incorrect as it is, to directly connect it with a plan for the removal of Dr. Rumney. One of these original corporators, who, for many years, was accounting warden and who is the only one of the "surviving" signers who has habitually attended the church within twelve years, with a frankness which does him honor, in the following letter disclaims any intention to pass judgment on Dr. Rumney.

GERMANTOWN, *February* 16, 1872.

REV. T. S. RUMNEY, D. D.

DEAR SIR:—In signing the paper, as one of the corporators of Christ Church, I only intended to say that it was got up as a Low Church. Further, as I stated at the time, I know nothing about, as not being a pew holder I wished not to take any part. I did object to the part (that Mr.

Hamm originated the church) which is not exactly correct. As regards the closing paragraph, the insinuation of your unfitness, I do not subscribe to. Not having been inside the church since you have had charge, I do not suppose I should be supposed to know anything about it. My family are at present thinking of taking a pew in the church.

Yours, &c.,

J. B. CHAMPION.

Mr. Edwin W. Lehman and Mr. G. M. Troutman also, have stated, that in signing the narrative they had no intension of reflecting in any way on the Rev. Dr. Rumney; that they had never seen Dr. Rumney or heard him preach, and knew nothing of the merits of the present controversy. Mr. Lehman has been in the church but once in eighteen years.

As no one of these "surviving" corporators has attended Christ Church for at least eight years, and as some of them have never attended it at any time, it is difficult to see how their sentiments, given in a general way, are entitled to the slightest weight in a controversy like the present. But as they have chosen to certify that the church was organized in the interests of the "Low Church party," it may be well to notice Article II of their charter of incorporation, which is as follows:

ARTICLE II.

"This church acknowledges itself to be a member of, and to belong to, the Protestant Episcopal Church in the State of Pennsylvania, and the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America. As such it accedes to, recognizes, and adopts, the constitution, canons, doctrine, discipline and worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the State of Pennsylvania, and of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, and acknowledges their authority accordingly. Any member of this church or corporation who shall disclaim or refuse conformity to the said authority, shall cease to be a member of this corporation,

and shall not be elected, or vote in the election for vestrymen, or exercise any office or function in, concerning or connected with the said church or corporation."

There is nothing here about the "Low Church party," but there is a promise of conformity to the "Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America," and an explicit acknowledgment of her doctrines and discipline. It is painful to be obliged to add that at least one member of the present vestry, a complainant in this controversy, notoriously repudiates some of the doctrines of the church, and offensively denounces the venerable formulary in which they are stated.

II. As to the election of Rev. Dr. Rumney:

The complainants state that Dr. Rumney was first nominated September 7th, 1869, then "*dropped;*" that Messrs. H. H. Houston and Crenshaw, "constituted themselves" a committee to go and hear him; that they "revived" his nomination on their return, and that on their statement only, and especially after their answers to certain questions, Dr. Rumney was elected "unseen, unheard, unknown," and that thereby they were beguiled into electing a rector who was not an "Evangelical man."

At the vestry meeting in September, 1869, Dr. Rumney, Dr. Canfield, Dr. Washburn, Revs. O. Perinchief, C. C. Tiffany and J. N. Stanger were nominated. At the October meeting a ballot was had, with no practical result. At the same meeting "it was moved that further nominations be made and *that all parties named at last meeting be continued as nominees*, which motions were seconded and carried," as appears by the vestry minutes. This plainly contradicts the statement that Dr. Rumney was "dropped." His nominator never withdrew his name in any way. Two meetings were held in November and one in December, and no result was reached, except that seven additional clergymen were

nominated. At one of the vestry meetings Mr. Powers was asked if Dr. Canfield was in favor of secession from the Episcopal Church if the Prayer Book was not altered. He said he did not know, but that *he* was. Under these circumstances it was not considered safe to vote for Dr. Canfield. A large number of the candidates were recommended by Rev. Heman Dyer, D.D.; and nearly all Dr. Dyer recommended were signers of the testimonial to Mr. Cheney, of Chicago. It was then agreed that each member of the vestry would visit the churches of some of the nominated candidates and report to the vestry. Messrs. W. C. Houston and Spencer, in accordance with this arrangement, "constituted themselves" a committee to hear the Rev. J. W. Brown. Messrs. Crenshaw and Killé did the same on another occasion. Mr. H. H. Houston "constituted himself" a committee to go and hear Rev. Mr. Langford. He did not hear him, but inquired about him, reported favorably to the vestry, and Mr. Langford was unanimously elected. He declined the election, and was again unanimously urged to come, but declined. Messrs. H. H. Houston and Crenshaw then went to hear Dr. Rumney. They had precisely the same authority any vestryman had previously had. No more, no less. They reported favorably. But Dr. Rumney was also recommended by Bishop Johns of Virginia, in a letter to a parishioner of Christ Church, by Bishop Stevens to Mr. Crenshaw, his nominator, by the Rev. Dr. Childs, and the Rev. Samuel Durborow, all certainly recognized as "Evangelical men." Bishop Stevens stated that he knew of Dr. Rumney, and that "the vestry would be safe in electing him without hearing him." Dr. Childs was expressly quoted by two of the complainants as partly deciding them in their minds how to vote. Dr. Rumney was unanimously elected, ten vestrymen being present and voting for him, viz.: Messrs. W. C. Houston, Le Boutillier, Mellor, Clark, Miskey, Crenshaw, H. H. Houston, Killé, Kingston and Schaeffer.

But the complainants now say that certain questions were

asked of and answered by Messrs. H. H. Houston and Crenshaw, by which they were misled (p. 7), as follows:

"Is Dr. Rumney an Evangelical man as we Low Churchmen understand it?

Ans. Yes.

Is Dr. Rumney willing to support the Evangelical societies, and only those, as it has been the invariable practice of Christ Church to support?

Ans. Yes."

This statement is not correct. The questions were not so asked, and the answers were not so given. What was asked and answered and stated will appear by the following certificate of five of the vestrymen then present and voting, two of whom *answered* the questions.

"The undersigned hereby certify that the following is a correct statement of the proceedings of the vestry meeting at which Dr. Rumney was elected:

"The statement made by Messrs. H. H. Houston and Crenshaw was that Dr. Rumney was a man Evangelical in his doctrine, a conservative Prayer Book Churchman, and not a party man. On being asked whether he bowed in the creed, the reply was he did. On being asked how he voted in convention, the reply was, such a question was not proper to be asked of a gentleman, but that we supposed he would act as his conscience dictated. After the balloting had commenced and seven had voted, A. Miskey stated that he had that day seen the Rev. Dr. Childs, who told him that Dr. Rumney was Evangelical in his doctrine, an excellent pastor, a hard worker in his parish and a good Sunday school man, and that he would suit our congregation admirably. Mr. Miskey then said that he voted partly on the representation of the two gentlemen who had seen Dr. Rumney, and partly upon the recommendation of Dr. Childs, as above expressed. W. C. Houston then said that he was willing to vote for any man endorsed by Dr. Childs, and, therefore, cast his ballot. After which, Mr. Le Boutillier did the same.

"The undersigned deny positively that the question was asked 'Whether Dr. Rumney was an Evangelical man *as we Low Churchmen understand it.*' We also deny that the question was asked, 'Whether Dr. Rumney was willing to support the Evangelical societies, *and only those.*'

H. H. HOUSTON,
S. B. KINGSTON,
JOS. A. SCHAEFFER,
SAMUEL K. KILLE,
E. A. CRENSHAW."

February 15, 1872.

How totally different is this from the statement put forth by the majority of the present vestry. The accuracy of the committee's statement may be further judged by the aid of this noteworthy fact. Only one of the committee of four which prepared it was present at the vestry meeting where the conversation occurred. Mr. Spencer was in Europe, and Messrs. Lewis and Whitney were not then in the vestry. Comment is needless.

The vestry appointed Messrs. Le Boutillier (now one of the complainants), H. H. Houston, and Crenshaw, a committee to inform Dr. Rumney of his election, and the following letter was sent by them:

GERMANTOWN, *February* 18, 1870.

REV. AND DEAR SIR:—It gives us great pleasure to notify you of your unanimous election to the Rectorship of Christ Church, Germantown, and to hand you a copy of the resolutions passed at a meeting of the vestry yesterday, viz.: "*Resolved*, That Messrs. H. H. Houston and Crenshaw, with the warden, be a committee to inform the Rev. T. S. Rumney, D. D., of his unanimous election as Rector of this parish, at an annual salary of two thousand five hundred (2,500) dollars, with use of the parsonage. *Resolved*, That an additional sum of five hundred (500) dollars, to be paid in advance, be appropriated to defray the expenses of his removal."

We believe that the unanimity of the vestry in extending you this call is a clear indication of the guidance of Divine Providence, and we trust it may be so regarded by you and cause your early acceptance of the trust.

The long period which has elapsed since we have had a Rector, has caused a serious reduction in the revenue of the church; the vestry hope that this state of things will be changed with your acceptance of the charge, and that we shall soon be enabled to offer you an increase of salary.

With sentiments of high regard, we remain very sincerely and truly yours.

CHARLES LE BOUTILLIER,
Warden.

H. H. HOUSTON,
E. A. CRENSHAW.

To Rev. T. S. RUMNEY, D. D.

Before accepting the call, Dr. Rumney visited Germantown. The ten members of the vestry who voted for him, and other members of the congregation were invited to meet him. A large number came. Full conversations were held with him by Mr. Le Boutillier, and other members of the vestry and congregation, and ample opportunity was given to ask any questions. On the following Sunday he preached. After the evening service, he said that if he thought there would be any opposition to him in the parish, he would not entertain the call. Mr. Miskey (now a complainant) assured him that there was no danger on that score. Not a murmur of dissatisfaction was breathed at that time by any one. How disingenuous is it therefore in the complainants to say (page 25) Messrs. Le Boutillier, Miskey, Spencer, W. C. Houston, &c., were not assembled! Had not the vestry elected Dr. Rumney unanimously? Did Dr. Rumney require any further evidence from those ten gentlemen than they had already given by their vote? As for Mr. Spencer, he was in Europe; and how the writer of the statement could have the

boldness to insinuate that he ought also to have been "assembled," it is difficult to imagine.

Under these circumstances, Dr. Rumney accepted the call, left the parish where *he* had lived in peace and harmony for "fifteen years," and came to Germantown, trusting that the promises of sympathy and hearty support would be made good. To quote from the "statement:" "On the 1st of May he came into residence in Germantown, amid the prayers and good wishes of an earnest people, delighted that they had again a Rector, and eager to resume in a regular manner their much-loved work in the parish. They hoped that the most prosperous days of the church were to be renewed, and that other and greater benefits were to result to the community from the revived influence of Christ Church. But, alas! this feeling did not continue."

Why did not this feeling continue, and when did it begin to falter? On the return from Europe of Mr. Charles Spencer, about the last of June, 1870. This gentleman, though an avowed Methodist, and though baptized, *refusing to be confirmed*, was a member of the vestry in direct contravention of the spirit of the second article of the charter of Christ Church.

III. Next, it is asserted that Dr. Rumney soon proved that he was not an "Evangelical man, as we Low Churchmen understand it."

If by this is meant that Dr. Rumney was not an "Evangelical man," as Low Churchmen generally understand it—the statement is unwarranted in fact. If, on the contrary, it is meant that Dr. Rumney was not a law-breaker, or a denouncer of the Prayer Book, or a sympathizer with such cheap "martyrs" as young Mr. Tyng and Mr. Cheney, the statement is true. But his views were and are Evangelical, and his sermons and services were such as are usual in Evangelical churches. Nothing has been pointed out in his sermons or services to which any exception could be justly taken. No complaint whatever was made by any

one until Mr. Spencer's return from Europe, and the complaints which were then originated by that gentleman—and which were carried by him, and some of those who sympathized with him, to the Bishop—were of so vague and frivolous a character that the Bishop felt compelled to declare that Dr. Rumney stood before him with an "unimpeached ministerial record."

Bishop Stevens' letter to Dr. Rumney, on this subject, is as follows:—

Philadelphia, *September* 30, 1871.

Rev. and Dear Sir:—I have received your note of the 28th instant, in which you say, "I would respectfully ask if you cannot give to my ministry in Christ Church that moral sanction which shall tend to allay any prejudice which may have arisen in some minds from a misapprehension, and enable me with greater confidence to fulfil the arduous duties which have my thought, my strength, my love." At the close of your note you again ask "as a matter of equity if I may not have from you, not *ex cathedra*, but as my spiritual adviser, some expression which will remove the opprobrium cast upon me by some to the temporary curtailing of my usefulness in the church of my Master."

To these requests I beg leave to say that you have already every "moral sanction" which I can give to one who stands before me to-day as you do, free from all personal or canonical reproach, and with an unimpeached ministerial record. I have confidence in your piety, your honesty, your fidelity to gospel truth, and in your single desire to win souls to Christ. The reasons which have been given to me by those wishing your removal, are not so much based on what you have done, as on the anticipations of what you may do. To deal, however, with inferential evils, when these inferences have but little if any basis of attested fact, is beyond the scope of civil or canon law.

You have assured me again and again that your views are unchanged from what they were when you were unanimously

elected Rector of Christ Church; that you never designed making any changes in the services or in the ecclesiastical status of that parish; and that your sympathies were with the *general* doctrines and policy of that class of men with which Christ Church has usually been identified. Hence, having no reason to doubt the truth of these assertions, I cannot but regret the keeping up of agitation on these points as unnecessary and unwise, and as detrimental alike to the peace and prosperity of your parish.

Trusting that by your sound and wholesome doctrine in the pulpit, and your prudent and godly conduct as a pastor, you may effectually put to silence the opposition which now disquiets your heart and your parish,

I remain very truly yours,

WM. BACON STEVENS.

Rev. Theo. S. Rumney, D. D.

The following reply was sent by Dr. Rumney:

Rectory of Christ Church,
Germantown, *October* 2, 1871.

Rt. Rev. and Dear Bishop:—Your reply to my letter reached me this evening, and I thank you sincerely for your kind words. To one part of that reply, I beg leave to allude, that in any future reference to it there may be no misunderstanding on the part of any.

You say you have been assured by me that my sympathies "are with the *general* doctrine and policy of that class of men with which Christ Church has usually been identified." By this I understand you *not* to mean that I sympathize with any who would destroy the unity of the church, or on either side disclaim or reject her authority and long established customs and usages. Such persons, in my opinion, go contrary to what my judgment teaches me is right, and also are in conflict with what I take the liberty of presuming from his published statements, are the opinions of my Bishop.

With this understanding, I can assure you, that it shall be my purpose (God being my helper) to persevere in the maintenance of that gospel truth, and that character of churchmanship which have hitherto marked my life, standing before you, as you say in your letter to me, "with unimpeached ministerial record."

Still trusting in Him who has ever sustained me, I shall hope to discharge the duties of my responsible position in a satisfactory manner, and above all so as to have His divine approval.

I remain faithfully and truly your son in the church,

THEODORE S. RUMNEY.

Rt. Rev. Bishop Stevens.

The statement that Dr. Rumney was unwilling to support the Evangelical societies is equally unfounded. A card had been prepared by Dr. Rumney's predecessor, Rev. Mr. Atkins, giving a list of all the collections outside of parochial objects. This list embraced all the "Evangelical societies," which it had been the "practice of Christ Church to support." This card was as follows:

CHRIST CHURCH,

GERMANTOWN (PHILADELPHIA).

Contributions.

Besides the regular Communion offerings, and the collections for incidental church expenses, collections will be made for the following objects:

January
February
March
April.....Diocesan Missions.
May.....P. E. Freedman's Commission.

June.....Sunday Schools of the Parish.
July.....Evangelical Knowledge Society.
August.....Evangelical Education Society.
September.....Domestic and Foreign Missions.
October.....Support of Episcopate.
November.....Parish Missions.
December.....Sunday School Anniversary.
Thanksgiving Day.....Episcopal Hospital.
Christmas Day.....Disabled Clergymen.

"GOD loveth a cheerful giver."—2 Cor. IX., 7.

A. B. ATKINS,
Rector.

Dr. Rumney followed the order prescribed on this card, and all the collections named on it were regularly made.

But strange clergymen preached "in his exchanges and occasional absences, who had never before addressed the congregation of Christ Church, and who were different entirely in their views from their dearly loved preachers;" and innovations were introduced. The "innovations" which were most complained of were, that Rev. Dr. Twing, the Secretary of the Board of Domestic Missions, was allowed to make an address, and that the other Episcopal clergymen in Germantown were allowed to preach in Christ Church, and were united with in religious services. The latter was in conformity with the very proper desire of Bishop Stevens, that at least a friendly accord should exist between the Rector of Christ Church and his Episcopal brethren in Germantown and that the former state of non-intercourse should cease.

Dr. Rumney only exchanged services with four clergymen, viz.: his successor at White Plains, Rev. Mr. Van Kleeck, Rev. Mr. Davidson, of Conshohocken, Rev. Dr. Yarnall, and Rev. Mr. Perry. Among the clergymen who were invited to preach may be named Rev. Mr. Atkins, Rev. Dr. Childs Rev. Dr. Watson, Rev. Mr. Wadleigh, Rev. Mr. Jaggar, Rev. Dr. Goodwin and Rev. R. C. Matlack. In order that the exact amount of damage inflicted on the complainants

may be ascertained, a full list of all the bishops and clergy who have in any way officiated during Dr. Rumney's rectorship, is printed in the appendix. It is worth mentioning that among those who preached *previously*, for Rev. Mr. Atkins, was the Rt. Rev. Bishop Hopkins, of Vermont, who was not considered by some a strictly "Evangelical man."

IV. The most serious charge made by the complainants is that since Dr. Rumney's rectorship, that "once flourishing parish" has been reduced to a "paralyzed condition;" that the missionary spirit has died out; that the collections have decreased; that the free reading room has perished; that the congregation has "dwindled down."

There is the same lack of foundation for these statements —and a suppression of important facts in such a manner as to give an impression the opposite of the truth. Any reader of the "statement" would suppose that the free reading room, &c., had perished at the hands of Dr. Rumney. It was unsuccessful and was *abandoned in the time of Mr. Atkins.* No one would infer from the "statement," that Centre Mission, that "great aid to the work of Home Missions," had been sold to St. Michael's Church, before Mr. Atkin's resignation and against his advice; and that Mr. Charles Spencer, the chairman of the committee to consider the sale, had said at that time (1869), the vestry were acting independently of the Rector; that "Mr. Atkins had overstaid his time, and should have left five years before." Yet such was the case. But the complainants say, "the workers who inaugurated and carried it on are ready and waiting for some new enterprise under a leader in sympathy with them." Mr. Barry, however, who was Superintendent of Centre Mission, and Trustee of the property, says that "This work was carried on by Mr. W. C. Taylor, Mr. Delacroix, Mr. Cardwell, Mr. Elkins, Mr. Killé, Mr. Tarr and myself, and also a few lady members of Christ Church," and thus writes:

"With regard to '*the workers who inaugurated*' this mission and carried it on, who were the persons mentioned

above, they have all disappeared with the exception of myself. Mr. Taylor now resides in Haddonfield, N. J.; Mr. Delacroix is dead; Mr. Cardwell is not with us; Mr. Elkins lives in the city, and Mr. Tarr has long since given up his interest, and, indeed, I may say that none of the old workers are in any condition to take up another enterprise of like character." Mr. Barry further states that the building was sold, because little interest was taken by Christ Church in the work, and it could no longer be successfully carried on.

That the missionary spirit has not "died out" is evidenced by the fact that a mission in Lehman street is now carried on under Dr. Rumney, which is fully as successful as Centre Mission.

That the parish has not been reduced to a "paralyzed condition," is proved by the following comparative statement:

In 1868, under the "prosperous" rectorship of Mr. Atkins, there were 94 pews and parts of pews rented and occupied by 103 tenants. While the Rev. Mr. Stanger was in charge, there were rented 89 pews, and parts of pews occupied by 97 tenants.

In 1872, under the rectorship of Rev. Dr. Rumney, there are rented 106 pews and parts of pews occupied by 119 tenants. This shows that 12 more pews and parts of pews are rented, occupied by 16 more tenants, than in the time of Mr. Atkins. There is not now a vacant pew to rent in the church. The congregations have never been larger than now, and it will be borne in mind that the falling off in revenue before Dr. Rumney came is expressly admitted in the letter calling him, which letter is signed by Mr. Le Boutillier, Warden. Indeed, strong corroborative evidence of the depressed condition of the church previously is furnished by the statement itself (p. 8). The committee say that on Dr. Rumney's arrival, the people were "eager to resume in a regular way their much loved work in the parish." They could not "resume" what they had not left off. Again, they

hoped that the most "prosperous days of the church were to be renewed," and looked for "greater benefits" from the "revived influence of Christ Church." This is a tolerably plain confession that the church had been going sadly behindhand under somebody.

Dr. Rumney then, instead of "paralyzing" the parish, has raised it from a depressed condition, notwithstanding the opposition of the small circle of complainants, and under his rectorship shows a better record in this respect than either of his predecessors. How manifestly unfounded therefore is the statement of his opponents, that he has "changed that once flourishing parish to a paralysed condition!" *

As to the collections for the Evangelical Societies, etc., the tabulated statement (p. 29) of the contributions for specific objects, professing to compare the "average of five years, from 1865 to 1869, inclusive," with the amount contributed in 1871, and thereby to show how "paralyzed" the parish has become under Dr. Rumney's pastorate, contains so many glaring misrepresentations that it is difficult to believe that it could have been put forth by the complainants.

The complainants state that while the *average* contributions for the years 1865 to 1869, inclusive, for Foreign Missions were $1,058.71, yet that in 1871, the amount contributed was only $41.82!

* A trivial conversation between Mr. Spencer and Dr. Rumney is detailed on p. 20 of the "statement," and when this was read before the court, it was admitted that Dr. R.'s answer was "I did *not*," and not "I did," as then read from the "proof" of the printer. Correction was promised, but has not been made, and the pamphlet appears perpetuating this improper report of Dr. Rumney's language. Between September 2d and 4th, Sunday intervened, and Monday's post brought Mr. Spencer's *copy* (not the original as requsted), about *ten minutes* (not thirty-six hours) before the letter to him was mailed. As several pages of criticism are expended by the complainants, based upon what the Rector did *not* say, it has been thought well to insert this note. In the same connection it may be mentioned that while Mr. W. C. Houston's "severe" note of August 25th, is printed at large, his note of September 20th, to Dr. Rumney, apologizing for the former, is not printed at all. (See appendix.)

The "Spirit of Missions" contains the following acknowledgments for Foreign Missions during 1871, viz.:

In June No. Christ Church, Germantown	$873 51
" July No. " " " Sunday school	32 10
" Nov. No. Christ Church, Germantown, Sunday school	32 95

Jan. No., 1872, amounts received prior to Dec. 1st, 1871, viz.:

Christ Church, Germantown	41 82
Thos. Drake	550 00
Chas. Spencer	550 00
For Rev. Mr. Auer's salary.	
Total	$2,080 38

The individuals above named are attached to Christ Church, Germantown, and their contributions have been previously credited to the church. Thus the contributions for Foreign Missions are shown to be increased in 1871, to nearly double the average of the five years previous. These figures tell their own story. Five hundred dollars, part of the first item, was contributed by H. H. Houston, in a check drawn to the order of Charles Spencer and by him endorsed.

The complainants give the following additional figures:

Objects of Collections, Average of five years from 1865 *to* 1869, *inclusive.*		1871.
Episcopal Hospital	$288 44	$65 50
Disabled Clergy	137 86	50 75
Evangelical Education Society	280 17	58 95

Average of four years, '65, '66, '68 and '69.

Evangelical Knowledge Society	$143 72 48 00

The contributions to the Episcopal Hospital were as follows:

From Christ Church and Sunday school	$197 68
" Individuals of the congregation, viz.:	
F. Mortimer Lewis	200 00
Chas. Spencer	100 00
	$497 68

Nearly double the average of five years previous, and more than seven times the amount said to have been contributed.

The contributions in 1871 for disabled clergy were:

From Christ Church	$50 75
" Chas. Spencer	50 00
	$100 75

The contributions in 1871 to the Evangelical Education Society were:

Aug. 15th, Christ Church, Germantown	$58 95
Same day, though credited on a different page, from individuals of congregation, viz.:	
Chas. Spencer	100 00
R. S. Spencer	25 00
C. Le Boutillier	20 00
J. W. Lewis	50 00
Total	$253 96

The above appears in the printed report of W. C. Houston, Treasurer of the Evangelical Education Society, who is

the chairman of the committee which prepared the statement. Charles Spencer and J. W. Lewis are also members of the same committee. Is it possible that they did not know that they had made such contributions?

The contributions to the Evangelical Knowledge Society in 1871, were:

Aug., Christ Church, Germantown		$48 00
" W. C. Houston,	"	50 00
" Chas. Spencer,	"	50 00
		$148 00

$4.28 *more* than the "average of four years," instead of $95.72 *less*, as stated by complainants. It is strange that intelligent business men could assume a disguise so thin as this! If they had kept their money in their pockets, or contributed it anonymously, the proof of their disingenuousness would not have been so readily apparent.

But the American Church Missionary Society, generally recognized as "Evangelical," has been strangely overlooked by the complainants. As they have not shown the "falling off in 1871," under Dr. Rumney's rectorship, the figures are here given.

Contributions from Christ Church, Germantown:

For year ending Oct. 1st, 1870	$223 35
" " 1871	473 85
Increase	$250 50

The authority for the foregoing corrected statements will mostly be found in the printed reports of the several societies.

Other contributions were made in 1871, through the Ladies' Sewing Society, the Women's Union Missionary Society, &c., which show a similar improvement, but which are omitted in order to make this answer less voluminous. Enough has been shown to fully disprove the statement that "the collections decreased," and that "the missionary spirit died out almost entirely."

V. It may be safely said that the dissatisfaction with Dr. Rumney, on the part of a small minority in the congregation, has *not* "resulted from his own action," but has been fomented by a very few individuals, and those individuals are the very same who stirred up controversies in Christ Church in the "prosperous" times of Mr. Atkins, which are now referred to as so "unruffled" Quite a number of dissatisfied persons then left the church, and were regularly transferred to St. Michael's.

VI. In conclusion, the complainants claim that they "represent the *congregation* in the fullest possible manner;" that the friends of the Rector have been "overwhelmingly defeated," and, on the strength of a unique document which certifies the result of the vestry election of 1872, in advance, promise that they will exclude from the next vestry all friends of Dr. Rumney.

Let us see how fully they represent the "*congregation.*"

First, as to the committee which prepared the statement.

The chairman, Mr. W. C. Houston, is only a resident of Germantown five months in the year, and considers his real "church home" to be the Church of the Atonement, Philadelphia. In 1868, he was so "ruffled by the waves of polemical discussion" in a controversy with Rev. Mr. Atkins, that he tendered his resignation to the vestry, and though it was not accepted, gave up his pew, and found a safe haven, without difficulty, at St. Michael's.

The second, Mr. Charles Spencer, is not even a confirmed

member of the church, and has therefore no moral right to be in the vestry at all, as the by-laws of the church provide that the vestry shall be lawful "communicants." He it is who has been the chief promoter of this unfortunate and groundless controversy.

Article I., Section 1, of the by-laws of Christ Church, provide "that the vestry shall consist of twelve persons, who shall be communicants of the said church."

Article II., of the charter, states expressly that this church "accedes to, recognizes, and adopts, the constitution, canons, doctrine, discipline, and worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church," &c., and acknowledges their authority. It further provides, that "any member of this church or corporation, who shall disclaim or refuse conformity to the said authority, shall cease to be a member of this corporation, and shall not be elected, *or vote in the election for vestrymen*,* or exercise any office or function in, concerning or connected with the said church or corporation."

Part of the doctrine and discipline of the Protestant Episcopal Church is set forth in "The Order of Confirmation," as printed in the Book of Common Prayer, and at the end of this office is found this rubric:

"And there shall none be admitted to the holy communion until such time as he be *confirmed*, or be ready and desirous to be confirmed."

Now Mr. Spencer never was confirmed, is not ready and desirous to be, and on the contrary expressly refused to be. No laxity of practice can excuse a direct disregard of this provision. Casuistry may endeavor to explain it away, but the church has said, in perfectly intelligible words, what

* And yet certain worthy gentlemen in Germantown, Presbyterians, Baptists, &c., no doubt in honest ignorance of the doctrines of the Episcopal Church, and who have no idea whatever of acceding to or recognizing the authority of its doctrines or discipline, who do not attend its services, but "refuse conformity to the said authority," and who therefore "are not entitled to vote in the election for vestrymen," actually join in certifying how they *will* vote at the next election, and blandly state their "belief" as to the "principles" upon which "the church was originally established!"

her mind is on this subject, and the morality of the case is plain.

The remaining two members of the committee, Messrs. Joseph W. Lewis and W. B. Whitney, are vestrymen of less than a year's standing, elected respectively by 5 and 8 majority in a vote of 47. One of these, Mr. Whitney, attended St. Luke's, Germantown, less than three years ago, and said Mr. Atkins was "too Low Church for him." At St. Luke's he may be reasonably supposed to have had some practice in singing that "new song in a strange land," from which he and his colleagues now so nervously "shrink."

Yet this committee gravely say "we and we only represent the principles of the church from its foundation!"

As accuracy in figures does not seem to be one of the gifts of the complainants, it is quite natural that the vote at the last vestry election (p. 10) is not correctly given. The "statement" reads: "The church voted 30 to 18 to leave out Messrs. Shapleigh and Crenshaw, and to substitute Messrs. J. W. Lewis and W. B. Whitney." For "church" read "pewholders of two years standing" (some of whom were Presbyterians and did not attend the church), and bear in mind that Mr. Whitney was not really eligible at the time, and received 28 votes, not 30, and Mr. Lewis 26 votes not 30, while Mr. Crenshaw received 21 votes and Mr. Shapleigh 20, instead of 18 each, and the "overwhelming majority" will be found to be somewhat moderated. Only one of the committee received as high as 30 votes, Messrs. Powers, Lewis and Mellor, had only 26 votes each, while Messrs. H. H. Houston (ten years a vestryman), S. B. Kingston and J. A. Schaeffer, who support the Rector, had respectively 47 and 46 votes. Yet the former contentedly say, "we and we only represent the principles of the church from its foundation."

But the most material point in this branch of the case to be answered, is whether the complainants do "represent the congregation in the fullest possible manner." This may be shown by a comparison of two papers presented to the members of the congregation for signature; one asking Dr. Rum-

ney to resign, and the other asking him to remain. These two lists have been carefully classified by one of the church wardens, so as to show the number of signers and the members of their families, so that each head of a family may have due credit for those he represents. On this basis those asking Dr. Rumney to resign would stand as follows:

Pew-holders and their families, ...	127
Members of congregation, ...	46
	173

Those asking him to remain would stand as follows:

Pew-holders and their families, ...	203
Members of congregation, ...	134
	337

Fully two-thirds of the congregation desire Dr. Rumney to remain, and fully one-half of the remainder would be perfectly satisfied to have him do so. The real malcontents are but a small portion of the congregation, but they have been untiring in their efforts to sway the minds of others. The most reckless and unfounded statements have been made in order to get signatures, or the right to attach them; for many of the names of persons asking the Rector to resign were written by over-zealous canvassers. The Rector was accused, without the slightest foundation in fact, of being "High Church," of misappropriating the funds of the church; and signatures were obtained upon the plea that the paper was simply to certify whether the signers were in favor of High Church or Low Church. The paper was thus presented to those who say that they saw "no writing at the top," only a list of names, and that they had no idea of asking Dr. Rumney to resign. Many afterwards acknowledged that they did not "know the difference between High Church and Low Church" and saw no change in the services from the time of Mr. Atkins. A system of pressure was brought

to bear upon some of the members of the congregation, especially by two of the complainants,* which would have been far from creditable in a merely political election. Mr. F. Mortimer Lewis, a member of the congregation, immediately after the receipt of the list of names, went with the Rector to see a number of these so-called signers. He took notes at the time of the statements made by each person called on, and these statements were copied, attested by him, and produced before the vestry on Sept. 5th, 1871. They fully show the means resorted to in order to gain signatures, and furnish a sad commentary on misapplied "Evangelical" zeal. These statements, just as submitted to the vestry, will be found printed in the appendix, together with one or two other certificates of similar character. The names of several persons who had not signed the request for Dr. Rumney's resignation, were quoted in a letter from Mr. Charles Spencer (p. 19), as "fully endorsing every word of the paper." At least one of these gentlemen, Mr. Edwin M. Lewis, gave no authority for such use of his name, as will appear by the following letter:

PHILADELPHIA, *February* 13, 1872.

REV. T. S. RUMNEY, D. D.,

DEAR SIR:—A pamphlet entitled "Statement of the Vestry of Christ Church, Germantown," &c., is before me.

I desire to say that the use of my name on page 19 was unauthorized by me, not only at the time when the letter was written, but at this present time.

As it seems necessary that I should define my views, I can only say that I do *not* concur with the majority of the vestry.

Very respectfully yours,

EDWIN M. LEWIS.

* See appendix, statements of Messrs. Schaeffer and Floyd.

It will thus be seen that a large number of those who are quoted by the complainants as desiring the resignation of Dr. Rumney, must be deducted from their list.

It is difficult to believe that even all the members of the committee were aware of the indefensible character of the statement they signed, and we would fain think that their names were attached improvidently. One of the five vestrymen who "endorsed" the statement of the committee (Mr. Clark), has admitted that he signed his name without reading it. But

"Some one had blundered."

The accounting warden, at least, Mr. Spencer, through whose hands the moneys of the church pass, should have known whether the financial statistics were or were not correct. Strangely enough, his yearly financial statements, which are carefully preserved in the vestry minutes from 1862 to 1869, inclusive, are as carefully omitted since 1869. And this is the gentleman who writes to Dr. Rumney, "The committee's only object is the glory of God in the good of the church."

As has been already said, this contention has been incited by a very few persons. The signers of the "statement" mainly represent themselves, and have very few real constituents. They now ask that their efforts shall be made effectual by the aid of this Board of Presbyters. There is a beneficent maxim of equity, "No man shall be allowed to take advantage of his own wrong." It has an appropriateness in connection with this case, and it may well be quoted here to show that no set of men can stir up strife in the church, and then successfully point to that strife as a reason why the innocent victim of it should be punished.

One word here as to the way in which this question of dissolution must be considered by the Board of Presbyters. Judge Hoffman, speaking of the thirty-fourth canon of 1832, which was substantially the same as the present canon, except as to the constitution of the tribunal, says:

"Again, what is the description and extent of the dissensions which warrant an interference under this canon? No strictly correct definition can be made. On the one side, however, they are not to be such as are the proper subjects of a presentment, or duty to the church requires that proceeding. On the other side, they ought not to be those occasional and almost unavoidable differences or bickerings, which will arise between a pastor and *portions* of his congregation. The question can only be rightly determined *according to the circumstances of each case*, cautiously bearing in mind the sound principle, that the door should not be too readily opened for such applications, and that *such a severance of the relation is against the policy and wishes of the church.*"

The complainants say in concluding their statement (p. 29), "Our narrative is now concluded, and you have the case before you. We have followed the history of the church down to the present time, in order that you may *understand fully on what grounds we desire the dissolution of the pastoral relation* between Dr. Rumney and the parish of Christ Church, seeing that we prefer no charges against Dr. Rumney, of any specific default as Rector."

And again (p. 30): "These are the *grounds* on which we beg *to rest our case* and to ask that Dr. Rumney resign."

The "narrative" of the complainants has been carefully reviewed, and every material point replied to. It is submitted that it has been amply shown in this answer that the grievances set forth are totally unfounded, and that there are no real "grounds" for the case to rest upon. The true position of the complainants is thus briefly stated in the letter of Bishop Stevens to Dr. Rumney (p. 13): "The reasons which have been given to me by those wishing your removal are not so much based on what you have done, as on the anticipations of what you may do. To deal, however, with inferential evils, *when these inferences have but little, if any, basis of attested fact, is beyond the scope of civil or canon law.*"

Having failed to convince the Bishop they now hope to convince this Board. The conclusion reached by the Bishop cannot fail to be reached by the Presbyters composing this tribunal.

The modest Rector who has thus been thrust into an unpleasant notoriety by this hearing, is still ready to extend the hand of forgiveness to these complainants. Though he has been deeply wronged by them, no harsh language towards them has escaped his lips, and he, at least, has never suggested that they should "go elsewhere." The responsibility of the foregoing presentation of the Rector's case rests with his counsel, and if any of the criticisms upon these complainants be thought severe, it is because the facts are severe. This statement of them now is due to justice. It must not be forgotten that the unfortunate publicity which may doubtless sooner or later result from this proceeding, has been the act of the complainants themselves. It was not too much to ask that they should at least have refrained from opposition to an irreproachable Rector, whom they, without any desire on his part, had assisted to unanimously elect and bring to Germantown from a peaceful parish where he had lived and labored successfully for nearly fifteen years, and against whom they now "prefer no charges of any specific default," and who was and is beloved and supported by a large majority of his present congregation. But they have chosen otherwise. The Rector at least will not shrink from any investigation which may be required. The question is in no sense a party one. It is simply whether justice shall be accorded by the majority of an "Evangelical" vestry to one who is in every true and honest sense of the word an "Evangelical" Rector, and who stands to-day, to quote the words of his Bishop, "free from all personal or canonical reproach, and with an unimpeached ministerial record."

J. ANDREWS HARRIS,
Clerical Advocate.

GEO. M. CONARROE,
Of Counsel for the Rector.

February 26, 1872.

PHILADELPHIA, *February* 26, 1872.

The undersigned vestrymen, former vestrymen and members of Christ Church, Germantown, hereby fully endorse the statements in the foregoing answer, and certify that the facts as therein set forth are true in all cases where they severally have personal knowledge.

We further certify to our firm belief that the interests of the parish and the interests of the Rector would be materially injured by a dissolution of the present pastoral connection; and that the peace of the church would be more disturbed by the removal of the Rector at the present time than by any other possible cause.

H. H. HOUSTON,
S. B. KINGSTON,
JOS. A. SCHAEFFER,
Vestrymen.

E. A. CRENSHAW,
SAMUEL K. KILLE,
M. S. SHAPLEIGH,
ED. BEDLOCK,
F. MORTIMER LEWIS,
JOS. B. BARRY,
C. BULLOCK.

APPENDIX.

Page.

A. Letter of Beekman Potter, the originator of Christ Church 35

B. Statement of Joseph A. Schaeffer 40

C. Statement of N. K. Ployd 41

D. Statements of persons whose names are attached to the paper asking Dr. Rumney to resign 43

E. List of all the clergymen who have officiated at Christ Church, Germantown, during the time of the present Rector 52

F. Statistics of Sunday School 53

G. Letter from the vestry and congregation at White Plains 54

H. W. C. Houston's letter of September 20th 57

I. Bishop Eastburn's decision 58

J. Canon 4, Title II., as amended 61

APPENDIX "A."

Letter from the Originator of Christ Church, Germantown.

Philadelphia, *February* 21, 1872.

My Dear Sir:—I have read the paper book entitled a "Statement of the Vestry of Christ Church, Germantown, regarding their controversy with the Rector," dated February, 1872, claiming to have some knowledge of the "organization of Christ Church," Germantown. I propose reviewing a portion of this "statement" and "narrative," believing by the time my review is finished, that the present "vestry," its "committee," and a majority of those who sign themselves as "incorporators and members of the vestry at the organization of the parish known as Christ Church, Germantown," will admit that they never have been "familiar with the causes which induced that organization."

The "committee of the vestry" declare in their "statement," "First:—That they desire to call attention to the "following narrative of the foundation of the church, pre-"pared by one of the corporators, and acquiesced in by the "surviving members of the original corporation, as witness "their signatures." I most sincerely regret, if I am informed correctly as to the author of this "narrative," that the gentleman in question did not have the manliness (when called upon for such a purpose) to at once acknowledge his entire ignorance of the whole subject. For I here assert (if my memory serves me rightly), and call upon him to substantiate me upon the witness stand: First, That he never attended a meeting of the vestry; Second, That he was not a resident of Germantown at the time; Third, That his name was used only for the purpose of organization and obtaining a charter; Fourth, That he has never contributed towards

the erection or support of the church, and lastly, That he has never been inside the church before or since his removal to Germantown six times, if as often. It is not, therefore, very difficult to judge of the character and accuracy of this "narrative" when coming from such a source.

In this remarkable "narrative" it is declared, that "Christ Church, Germantown, was originated by Mr. P. E. Hamm, long a member and Warden of Grace Church, Philadelphia," &c. Having already alluded to the ignorance of this narrator, it may possibly be of advantage (after a lapse of twenty years) to record the yet unknown and unwritten history of the "organization of this parish."

Early in the year 1852, having perfected business arrangements which required my permanent residence in Germantown, I called upon the late bishop of the diocese, and announced my intended removal thither, and my intention of starting another Episcopal Church in the borough, which received his cordial approval. Immediately after settling in my new "church home" with this object in view, I consulted with Messrs. John B. Champion and Charles L. Scott, then residing in Germantown, who willingly joined me in this new work of labor and love. After an interchange of views and a survey of localities, it was decided that the Menonist meeting-house, situate on the Main street, above what is now called Herman street, would answer our purposes, if attainable. In company with Mr. C., I called upon Mr. John Rittenhouse, Senior, who was then the leading member and trustee of that corporation, and notified him of our object and desire to rent their building for the purpose of having services therein, and establishing a new Episcopal Church. (Their own congregation having dwindled down to but few in numbers, and holding their services but once a month, in the morning.) Mr. R. listened attentively to the appeal, and promised to place the subject before his people at their next meeting. He did so, and at our next interview with him, he kindly granted me the use of their building *without charge;* the only proviso being that I would employ

their sexton, and deliver up to them uninjured, their church, whenever demanded. (This building was so occupied until the congregation of Christ Church removed to their present location.) Thankful for the kindness so liberally extended us by entire strangers, I immediately, in connection with the gentlemen named, commenced proceedings for the opening of a Sunday school. And after posting bills throughout the neighborhood and borough, announcing that a Sunday school would be opened in said building upon the following Sunday, in accordance with the rites and forms of the Episcopal Church, awaited the coming event with peculiar interest. In the interim, having heard that a lady resided in Germantown who had been a member of the church in Philadelphia with which I was previously connected, I sought her, announced my intention, solicited her assistance, which was promised and faithfully given. The eventful Sunday arrived, and with it the opening of the school; there being present six teachers and seventeen scholars. Thus "originated Christ Church, Germantown." From week to week the school largely increased in numbers as to both teachers and scholars. I then determined, with the help of my co-workers, to inaugurate the church services upon every Sunday evening and without money and without friends, apparently, but relying upon the promises of the Master, that "where two or three are gathered together in His name, "He would be in their midst," announced and published that Episcopal services would be held regularly in the church upon every Sunday evening. This programme was carried out, "not occasionally," as this narrator declares, but without intermission for nine months, when the services were changed to morning and evening. In the meantime it became necessary to organize a "vestry" and obtain a charter. This was a difficult task to accomplish, in consequence of the scarcity of Episcopalians not connected with St. Luke's Church, and it was owing to this difficulty, and at the request of those deeply interested in the work, that some of these gentlemen now signing the "narrative" (and non-

residents of Germantown) permitted their names to be used for the purpose of making up the vestry and obtaining a charter. That instrument I believe to be in my handwriting; and in it these gentlemen declare, over their own signatures, that "This church acknowledges itself to be a member of, and to belong to, the Protestant Episcopal Church in the State of Pennsylvania, and in the United States of America." I have yet to learn that in this church there has been any deviation therefrom.

Mr. P. E. Hamm, spoken of in the "narrative" as the originator of the church, was at the time a member and pewholder of Saint Luke's Parish, and when called upon and informed of the progress and apparent success of the enterprise, identified himself with the movement. Subsequently, one or two others of these "narrative" signers removed to Germantown, one connecting himself with Christ Church for a time as member and vestryman, and, afterwards leaving, organized and carried to successful completion Calvary Church, Germantown; but not so with this "corporator and historian, who, overflowing with knowledge as regards the "organization of Christ Church," Germantown, and devoted with love and zeal to what is called the "Low Church party." Upon *his* removal to Germantown in these latter years he first connected himself with Calvary Church as aforesaid, and is now, if I am not misinformed, a member of the Church of Saint John the Baptist.

The "narrative" further declares that "Mr. Hamm went "to work contributing liberally of his means and ob- "taining liberal subscriptions to the new parish." Without reflecting in the least upon "Mr. Hamm," it will not be improper to say that he did no more than any other active member of the vestry at the time, each contributing either by labor or money to the good work. The lot of ground upon which the church now stands, the stones which form its foundations, as well as those which line its inner walls, were the noble gift of Mr. Fallon, obtained through the personal influence and instrumentality of the writer. And it may

with truth and justice be added, that but for this most generous donation, years would have elapsed before a building known as Christ Church could have been erected in Germantown; for the "liberal contributions" received up to that period did not justify the undertaking.

It is also stated by the "committee" in their "statement" that this "narrative of the foundation of the church" is "acquiesced in by the surviving members of the original "corporation; as witness their signatures." As the originator of the church, as its first Sunday School Superintendent for three years, as one of its "incorporators," as a member of its "original vestry," as a member of the church for nineteen years, and finally as one of the "surviving members of the original corporation," I cannot but proclaim this assertion to be without foundation in fact, and none know better than the "committee" who put forth this paper book, that at least one other of the "incorporators and surviving members of the original corporation" is *still living* and in Germantown, *and has*, if my information be correct, *refused to sign this very narrative.*

If these things be so, I ask what reliance can be placed upon the remaining portions of this "Statement of the vestry of Christ Church, Germantown, regarding their controversy with their Rector."

Very truly yours,

BEEKMAN POTTER.

Mr. H. H. Houston,

Rector's Warden, Christ Church, Germantown.

APPENDIX "B."

Statement of Jos. A. Schaeffer, a Member of the Present Vestry.

A few days after the Easter election in 1871, Mr. Spencer sent for me on a plea of business, and taking me into a private office, he made allusion to several glasses broken in his factory, but almost immediately directed the conversation to church matters, having much to say reflecting upon the present Rector, and his connection with the church. He said to me, "*I have a paper requesting Dr. Rumney to resign his position as Rector of Christ Church, nine of the present vestrymen have already signed the paper, and I want you to make the tenth.*" I then replied that Mr. Clark, *one of the nine*, in a recent conversation with me, said that he would not sign a paper requesting Dr. Rumney's resignation. Mr. Spencer then said, "Mr. Clark is a *changed man*, and is now with us and *has signed the paper.*"

In contrast to this statement of Mr. Spencer, I will here say, that within two or three days after, I asked Mr. Clark in regard to it. He stated positively that he *had not* and *would not* sign *against Dr. Rumney.* I will also add, I afterwards met Mr. A. Miskey, also one of the nine, and told him that Mr. Spencer had informed me that he had signed a paper which he (Mr. Spencer) had at the time, requesting Dr. Rumney to resign. He denied it, saying: "*I have not signed such a paper*, and would not raise a finger against Dr. Rumney."

To return to my conversation with Mr. Spencer. Mr. Spencer continued to bring forward inducements to persuade me, if possible, to sign the paper, among which was one, which he stated he had presented to a friend of mine, to secure his vote at the recent election for vestrymen, which

was, that if he would vote the ticket presented by him (Mr. Spencer) any *loss which* might follow from the withdrawal of the influence of the gentlemen sustaining Dr. Rumney, should be made up to him four-fold, by him (Mr. Spencer).

This I considered as a bait to secure my signature to the paper, which he said he had, and which was signed by the nine vestrymen, but which he did not allow me to see. Thus continuing to urge me to sign till the time came for him to go to the city, he took out his watch, and starting hastily, he turned to me with the demand, "*Will you or will you not sign that paper?*" I replied that I would not. He then said "You will be sorry for it." We then separated. Before that time I had received his patronage—since then I have not received one order from him.

JOSEPH A. SCHAEFFER,

Germantown, *February* 19, 1872.

APPENDIX "C."

Statement of N. K. Floyd.

I am a member of Christ Church, Germantown. Was baptized and confirmed by Rev. Mr. Atkins. Previous to the last election of vestry I was called on by Messrs. C. Spencer and Miskey to vote for a ticket with the names of Mr. Shapleigh and Mr. Crenshaw left off. I told them that it would be a sacrifice of principle to vote against Dr. Rumney, as we had nothing against him. They both assured me that it was not a war against Dr. Rumney, but against High Church principles, and if their ticket was elected they would not interfere with Dr. Rumney. They pressed their grievances so hard, and it seemed so plausible, that I told them that if they were correct in their assertions I would not be bound to Dr. Rumney. I met Mr. H. H. Houston, who was my sponsor in baptism; he had been recommended

for my sponsor by Rev. Mr. Atkins (formerly rector) as his best supporter, and as a Christian gentleman. Mr. Houston stated the whole difficulty, which only confirmed my own opinion that Dr. Rumney was right. I have endeavored to sustain him to the best of my feeble ability, and will continue to do so until I find that I am in error.

I have been by occupation a painter; was employed last summer by a painter to assist on Mr. Charles Le Boutillier's house. As soon as I arrived Mr. Le B. made his appearance and said he wanted to ask a few questions. He then commenced, was I High or Low? I told him I was classed as Low; but that I considered myself an Episcopalian. He then demanded to know if I signed Dr. Rumney's paper? I said I did. He then gave me an invitation to leave his place. He seemed very violent at first at all who did not agree with him. I do not think it would be any credit to any cause to repeat the language used. Mr. Le B. cooled down and assured me that if I would take my name off Dr. Rumney's paper and sign one against him, he would let me go to work on his house. This mild proposition I most emphatically refused, and left the premises.

I have had frequent interviews with Dr. Rumney. I find him an honest Christian gentleman. His object is to do good for Christ and man. I therefore repeat that he has my support and confidence.

N. K. PLOYD.

February 17, 1872.

APPENDIX "D."

Statements of persons whose names are appended to the paper asking Dr. Rumney to resign, who never AUTHORIZED THEIR NAMES to be used for such purpose.*

Mr. JORDAN, Main and Church Streets.

Miss , called on me and said the paper was to decide whether the church be High or Low Church. I have nothing against you (Dr. Rumney), and did not know that the paper requested you to resign. I did not read the paper. I do not wish you to leave the church. I only desire the church be not made a High Church. My wife would not sign the paper. I am not a member of your church. I attend the Lutheran Church.

Stated in our presence,
F. MORTIMER LEWIS,
T. S. RUMNEY.

September 5, 1871.

Mrs. GREENROD.

Miss called to see me and had a paper. Said it was to decide whether we be High or Low Church. I said what was the difference? She said that I could not understand, not being educated, but that there was, and it was to decide that she wanted my name. I said that she knew best, and I would leave it to her to settle. I afterwards called on Miss , and ordered her to take my name off the paper, as I did not see any change in the church; but she said it was too late. I am very sorry that my name was

* NOTE.—The names of the ladies who called on these persons are omitted at the request of Dr. Rumney, in order to shield them from unpleasant notoriety. They can be furnished to the court if required.

put on the paper. I like you (Dr. Rumney), and do not wish you to leave the church. I have before asked you to take my name off the paper if you should receive it.

Stated in our presence,

F. MORTIMER LEWIS,
T. S. RUMNEY.

September 5, 1871.

Mrs. E. Smith, Centre Street.

I never signed a paper asking you (Dr. Rumney) to resign; nor would I do so, as I do not wish you to leave us. I did not sign any paper nor tell any person to sign for me.

Stated in our presence,

F. MORTIMER LEWIS,
T. S. RUMNEY.

September 5, 1871.

Miss M. A. Keenan, Main Street.

I do not belong to Christ Church. I attend the church at Mt. Airy. Iwas asked to go to a meeting at Miss one evening. It was there stated that we must decide whether Christ Church be a High or Low Church; that a paper was in circulation by the High Church party, and we must try to keep Christ Church a Low Church. The paper that was afterwards used was not at this meeting. I have nothing against you (Dr. Rumney), only don't want a High Church. I would not have gone to the meeting if I had known what it was for.

Stated in our presence,

F. MORTIMER LEWIS,
T. S. RUMNEY.

September 5, 1871.

Mrs. Keenan, Main Street.

I was at the meeting at Miss , and did not hear anything about asking you (Dr. Rumney) to resign, only that we must decide between High and Low Church. I liked the church as it was under Mr. Atkins. On returning to Germantown after an absence of some years, I see more change in the people than I do in the Rector. I am sorry that I went to the meeting. I was told at the meeting that all the money of the church was now going to the High Church party.

Stated in our presence,

F. MORTIMER LEWIS,
T. S. RUMNEY.

September 5, 1871.

Mrs. Bronson, Haines Street.

I never signed a paper asking you (Dr. Rumney) to resign. I signed a paper at the house of Miss , which had no writing on it, except some names, which was only to have a Low Church. Nothing was said about your resigning. I would not sign such a paper, as I do not wish you to leave us. All I wanted was not a High Church. I do not know what the difference is between High and Low Church. I see no difference in the church services from the time when Mr. Atkins was here; I am perfectly satisfied with the services as now conducted by you (Dr. Rumney), and wish no change.

Stated in our presence,

F. MORTIMER LEWIS,
T. S. RUMNEY.

September 5, 1871.

Mrs. Fredman, Haines Street.

I did not sign the paper. Miss said it was my duty to sign it, and said something would hurt my children. It was something in the communion. I do not know what

she meant. She put my name down. I never said that I signed the first paper without reflection. Miss came a number of times for me to sign, and worried me so, that to get rid of her I said she could put my name down. She talked about High Church and said they all loved Dr. Rumney. I did not wish you to resign, and do not now wish you to leave us. I have been much worried about the use of my name. I do not wish you to go away. I see no difference in the church services now and I do not know what the trouble is about.

Stated in our presence,

F. MORTIMER LEWIS,
T. S. RUMNEY.

September 5, 1871.

Mrs. PALMER, Morton Street.

I attended a meeting at Miss and heard them talk about High and Low Church. I signed merely to keep our's a Low Church. I do not recollect hearing anything said about your (Dr. Rumney) resigning. I see no difference in the services now. I did not sign for you to resign.

Stated in our presence,

F. MORTIMER LEWIS,
T. S. RUMNEY.

September 5, 1871.

JOHN PALMER.

I heard it stated that you (Dr. Rumney) appropriated the funds of the church for High Church purposes, and I signed only for a Low Church. I do not remember that anything was said about your going away. I see no difference in the services in the church now from formerly. I did not think it right that the church funds should be appropriated to wrong

purposes, and that made me sign; and I confess that I was prejudiced against you on that account.

Stated in our presence,

F. MORTIMER LEWIS,
T. S. RUMNEY.

September 5, 1871.

Mrs. GOODMAN, Centre Street.

I only signed a paper against a High Church, and did not hear anything about your (Dr. Rumney) going away, and I am very sorry now that I was induced to sign; I only signed against a High Church. I see no change now in the services in the church from formerly. I do not wish you (Dr. Rumney) to leave us. I did not read the paper. I only saw a few names on it; no other reading was on it that I know of.

Stated in our presence,

F. MORTIMER LEWIS,
T. S. RUMNEY.

September 5, 1871.

Mrs. S. A. GURLING, Centre Street.

I never signed a paper requesting you (Dr. Rumney) to resign. A paper was shown to me by two ladies, and I was asked to sign to keep the church from being a High Church. I said I did not understand the matter, and they did not tell me. I only saw a few names on the paper, which was folded, and thought it was only against High Church. I have no fault with you (Dr. Rumney) and do not wish you to leave us. The ladies were Miss and Miss

Stated in our presence.

F. MORTIMER LEWIS,
T. S. RUMNEY.

September 5, 1871.

Mrs. Axford.

Miss called here and asked me if I did not wish to have a Low Church. I was very busy at the time and said that I did; only that I had nothing against Dr. Rumney, and did not wish him to leave; but that they might sign my name if they pleased for a Low Church. I do not know the difference between High and Low Church.

Stated in our presence,

F. MORTIMER LEWIS,
T. S. RUMNEY.

September 5, 1871.

Miss M. Elkins, Chelton Avenue.

Miss called and talked about High Church and persuaded me to sign a paper. Nothing was said about you (Dr. Rumney) resigning. I am very sorry that I signed the paper, but was over-persuaded and hardly knew what I did. I said that Dr. Rumney kept close to the Prayer Book, and that I did not wish him to leave. I regret that I was induced to sign, and would be glad to have my name taken off the paper. I certainly wish you to remain here.

Stated in our presence,

F. MORTIMER LEWIS,
T. S. RUMNEY.

September 5, 1871.

Robert Cupitt, Engle Street.

I am very sorry that I signed the paper for Miss She talked about Low Church, and I signed only to keep a Low Church. Nothing was said about you (Dr. Rumney) resigning, or I would not have signed, as I do not wish you to go away; only I wish to have a Low Church. I regret that I signed the last paper, and never stated that I signed the first paper without reflection.

Stated in our presence,

F. MORTIMER LEWIS,
T. S. RUMNEY.

September 5, 1871.

Mrs. E. Cupitt.

I did not hear anything about you (Dr. Rumney) leaving the church. The talk with Miss and Miss was about Low Church, which is what I like. I did not sign for you (Dr. Rumney) to leave us, and I do not wish you to go away.

Stated in our presence,

F. MORTIMER LEWIS,
T. S. RUMNEY.

September 5, 1871.

Mrs. Brandreth, Engle Street.

Miss called and asked me to sign a paper to keep our church from being a High Church, which I refused to sign. She made me promise to call at her house in the afternoon. When I was there she brought out the paper and I signed it, only because I do not want our church like the Roman Catholic. I see no difference now from when Mr. Atkins was here. Miss said that you (Dr. Rumney) intended to make it a High Church.

I told Mr. Cupitt that I was sorry that I signed the paper, and would like to have my name taken off. I do not wish you to leave us. I hope you will stay with us.

Stated in our presence,

F. MORTIMER LEWIS,
T. S. RUMNEY.

September 5, 1871.

Mrs. Twist.

I signed the paper, as I wished the church kept on Mr. Atkins' platform. I have nothing against you (Dr. Rumney), and only signed to keep our church a Low Church. I cannot say that I see any difference in the church services, but there is a difference in the prayer meeting.

Stated in our presence,

F. MORTIMER LEWIS,
T. S. RUMNEY.

September 5, 1871.

Mr. Twist.

I was not at home when the paper was brought here, and I did not sign it. I have nothing against you (Dr. Rumney.)

Stated in our presence,

F. MORTIMER LEWIS,
T. S. RUMNEY.

September 5, 1871.

Mrs. Ann Steere.

When the ladies, Miss and Miss called here, they said that Dr. Rumney was going to make Christ Church a High Church, and they wanted our names for a Low Church. Nothing was said about Dr. Rumney going away. I told them to put down my name, my husband's, and my daughter Lizzie's for a Low Church. My husband does not go to church, except sometimes with me at night. He is not a member. My daughter signed at Mrs. also for a Low Church. We have nothing against you (Dr. Rumney), and wish you to stay. I do not know the difference between High and Low Church.

Stated in our presence,

F. MORTIMER LEWIS.
T. S. RUMNEY.

September 5, 1871

Mrs. Sykes, Bowman Street.

A paper was brought to me to sign, and I was told that it was only to have the church the same as when Mr. Atkins was there, and nothing else. Since, I have been told that the paper was to ask you to leave; and I have said that I was very sorry that I signed it. I only signed to have the church as it was. I do not wish you to resign at all. I am very sorry that I signed.

Stated in our presence,

F. MORTIMER LEWIS,
T. S. RUMNEY.

September 5, 1871.

Miss McNaughton, Washington Lane.

I was told that papers were being taken around among the people, one for High Curch, and one for Low Church, and I was asked which I would sign. I said I would sign for Low Church. I never thought of such a thing as asking you (Dr. Rumney) to leave. I thought that you might change your views to that of the Low Church when you saw the paper. If you could not, that you might probably leave us. I did not sign to ask you to resign, only for Low Church; and had I known all that I now know, I would not have signed the paper.

Stated in our presence,

F. MORTIMER LEWIS,
T. S. RUMNEY.

September 5, 1871.

Henry Freas, Main Street.

The paper which I signed was only for a Low Church. Nothing was said to me about my signing to ask you (Dr. Rumney) to resign. I did not read the paper, but from what was said to me, I was under the impression that the paper was only to keep the church a Low Church, and to have no change brought in. I also signed for my wife for the same reason.

Stated in our presence,

F. MORTIMER LEWIS,
T. S. RUMNEY.

September 8, 1871.

Daniel P. Freas, Main Street.

I was busy when the paper was brought to the store, and read it over hastily. I do not remember that it said anything about your (Dr. Rumney) resigning; all that I supposed it was, was a desire to keep the church as a Low Church.

Stated in our presence,

F. MORTIMER LEWIS,
T. S. RUMNEY.

September 8, 1871.

APPENDIX "E."

List of clergymen who have preached or officiated in Christ Church under Dr. Rumney.

Rev. Dr. Williamson, Wilkesbarre.
Rev. T. W. Martin, Lewistown.
Rev. Dr. Fitch (uncle of Mr. Whitney of the Committee).
Rev. Dr. Hay, Radnor.
Rev. J. Houston Eccleston.
Rev. R. C. Matlack.
Rev. Jno. G. Furey.
Rev. Dr. Childs.
Rev. A. Shiras, D. D.
Rev. Mr. Page, of Tenn.
Rev. J. N. Stanger.
Rev. A. B. Atkins (twice).
Rev. Dr. Benj. Watson.
Rev. Dr. Hawkins, Chambersb'g.
Rev. Dr. Spalding, Wisconsin.
Rev. J. K. Murphy, Germantown.
Rev. A. Wadleigh, Germantown.
Rev. G. L. Bishop, Germantown.
Rev. Dr. Oliver.
Rev. S. D. Hinman.
Rev. Dr. Smedes, North Carolina.
Rev. Dr. Goodwin.
Rev. R. T. Roach, D. D.
Rev. A. T. Twing, D. D.
Rev. Mr. Cathell.
Rev. Sam'l Durborrow.
Rev. W. H. Hare.
Rev. Mr. Cullen.
Rev. Mr. Diehl.
Rev. T. A. Jaggar.
Rev. J. DeW. Perry.
Rev. Dr. Yarnall.
Rev. F. B. Van Kleeck, White Plains.
Rev. Mr. Davidson.
Bishop Randall.
Bishop Morris.
Bishop Tuttle.
Bishop Clarkson.
Bishops Johns and Bedell have been both invited, and could not come.

APPENDIX "F."

PHILADELPHIA, *February* 16, 1872.

REV. THEODORE S. RUMNEY,
GERMANTOWN, PA.,

REV. AND VERY DEAR SIR:—In pursuance of your expressed wishes, I now enclose herein a statistical table, compiled from my Sunday school records for the seven preceding years, as well as the small fractional part of present year. The numbers stated are those in attendance on Advent Sunday for the respective years.

Truly yours,
SAMUEL K. KILLE,

Assistant Superintendent Christ Church Sunday school, Germantown.

Year.	Total Pupils in School.	Total Bible Classes.
1865	341	71
1866	318	70
1867	413	73
1868	335	73
1869	345	80
1870	305	75
1871	326	74
1872	328	74

Included in list of Bible classes for each of the above years were 34 pupils of Mad. Clement's school.

It may be here noted that at the last confirmation in Christ Church (in 1871), a class of thirty was presented to the Bishop.

APPENDIX "G."

Letter from White Plains.

Understanding that reports have been recently circulated in Germantown, to the effect that Dr. Rumney's congregation, at White Plains, N. Y., were tired of him, and were glad to get rid of him, the following letter is inserted to show the utter falsity of such reports:

"Since reports have reached this parish, that certain persons, inimical to our former beloved Rector in his present field of labor, are endeavoring to bring accusations against him, so as to remove him, if possible, from his position in Christ Church, Germantown; therefore,

We, the Rector, Wardens and Vestrymen of Grace Church, White Plains, in special session assembled, deem it but an act of duty towards the Rev. T. S. Rumney, D. D., to make the declarations proclaimed below in regard to him, which declarations we subscribe with our own names, inviting thereafter the signatures of all available members of the congregation, that, thus endorsed, they may be sent to Mr. H. H. Houston, Rector's Warden in Dr. Rumney's Vestry, to be used by him in any emergency, in which they could be of service.

We declare:

1. That under Dr. Rumney's rectorship in this parish the greatest *harmony* prevailed, and to such a degree, that the delightfully harmonious relations existing between Rector, vestry and congregation, became a marked topic of conversation during meetings of the clergy of the Southern Missionary Convocation.

2. That his *success* as a Rector can easily be demonstrated by *two* circumstances, *one* being, that the modest wooden structure in which he began his ministrations, soon became

too small for the steadily increasing congregation, and had to give way to the present beautiful and commodious church edifice; the other being, that this parish, from having been small and comparatively unimportant, became one of the most flourishing and useful in the county.

3. That he was beloved and revered not only by all the members of his church and congregation, but by all the people of this village and district that knew him, no matter whether they belonged to the Methodist, Baptist, Presbyterian, or any other church.

4. That his departure brought grief to every heart, and that the poor of all sects lost in him their best friend.

5. That his purity and simplicity of life, his untiring and unselfish devotion to all who needed aid, procured to him, most justly, the undivided love of the entire people, who censured only the last act of his life amongst them, the one which took him from their midst—his acceptance of the call to Christ Church, Germantown.

White Plains, N. Y., *January* 18, 1872.

F. B. Van Kleeck,
Rector Grace Church, White Plains, N. Y.

Joshua Horton,	Elisha Horton,
	Wardens.
M. M. Fisher,	Wm. H. Huestis,
W. P. Burnham,	J. C. Buckhout,
E. T. Preudhorme,	Samuel Faile,
H. Ernest Schmid,	S. A. Martin,
	Vestrymen.
Jane Cammann,	David Horton,
Phebe McDonald,	Isaac V. Fowler,
W. H. Dearman,	J. O. Dykman,
Mrs. S A. Dearman,	Jno. L. Anderson,
John Philips,	F. Carpenter,

Mary Philips,
F. H. Powell,
R. Kennedy,
E. Kennedy,
J. E. Kennedy,
Henry Williams,
Mary E. Williams,
Mary E. Baldwin,
O. Cross,
St. John Brown,
John Metzer,
Joseph Lye,
Helfrich Bromm,
Conrad Bromm,
Lewis Buckhout,
J. W. Buckhout,
Edward Schimer,
L. S. Peck,
F. J. Preudhorme,
Eliza H. Fisher,
Caroline Fisher,
Mrs. Selina H. Thompson,
Gilbert Lyon,
Anna Lyon,
Sarah C. Lyon,
Phebe Lyon,
Lizzie F. Walton,
Mrs Mary Farr,
Thomas Prior,
N. B. Hunter,
A. K. Dunn,
Walter G. Mackay,
Elisha Horton, Jr.,
Henry M. Bissell,
Mrs. Julie Adler,
M. J. Adler,
A. Adler,
E. T. Adler,
A. S. Jarvis,
Mrs. A. S. Jarvis,
Mrs. A. S. Davis,
Miss N. Jarvis,
Anna H. Jones,
Mrs. S. B. Attwater,
Katharine C. Smith,
Sarah M. Jarvis,
M. F. Harris,
Mrs. M. M. Fisher,
H. A. Little,
Mrs. Wm. Huestis,
E. S. Underhill,
Joseph Thompson,
Mrs. A. Roe,
Louisa Roe,
Elizabeth Roe,
Mrs. E. Prior,
Alex. W. Russell,
R. L. Zimmerman.

APPENDIX "H."

MR. W. C. HOUSTON'S LETTER.

E. Washington Lane,
Germantown, *September* 20, 1871.

Rev. T. S. Rumney, D. D.,

Dear Sir:—I have been informed that during my absence from home, my son, on putting on a coat that he had not worn for some weeks, discovered in the pocket of the same a letter addressed to me. Having authorized him to open my letters during my absence, he opened it, and finding it was from you, repaired at once to your house to make to you his explanation of the subject, and as you were absent, made it to Mrs. Rumney.

Of the character of his explanation I have no knowledge beyond the above, as he had to leave home on business before I reached home, and has not yet returned; but I presume it to be that the letter was handed to him by the carrier; that he put it in his pocket, intending to hand it to me, but happening to change his coat, and not to wear it again for several weeks, he entirely forgot the receipt of it.

I can only say, that I sincerely regret the occurrence—especially that the first that has happened should have been with your letter, which the committee felt they had a right to expect from you; but now having it, and finding it was dated five days after our communication, it is but just that you should be relieved from a seeming want of courtesy as implied in the note addressed to you under date of August 25th.

Your letter of 2d, postmarked 4th instant, was not received by me until Saturday evening. My son was expected home yesterday, and I delayed sending you a "written acknowledgment of the missing letter," hoping to have from him

his explanation to send to you, but as he has not arrived, I have deemed it best to wait no longer.

Repeating my regret of the unfortunate occurrence, I am

Very respectfully yours,

W. C. HOUSTON,

Chairman of Committee.

P. S.—I open this to say that my son has just arrived at home. He says my explanation of the cause of delay of yours of 31st July, is substantially correct, and that he will hand you this, if you are in, and confirm my statement.

APPENDIX "I."

Bishop Eastburn's Decision.

Note.—As Bishop Eastburn is expressly referred to by the complainants as one of their "highly esteemed fathers" in the church, his fatherly action in the following case ought to have weight with them. It is certainly a case in point for the consideration of this tribunal.

A statement of the case of the Rev. William Rawlins Pickman, Rector of St. Peter's Church, Salem, Massachusetts.

Mr. Pickman was rector of St. Peter's Church, and on April 18th, 1865, received the following communication:

Easter Tuesday, *April* 18, 1865.

Rev. and Dear Sir:—At the annual Easter meeting last evening the following resolutions were passed by a vote of thirty-four yeas to fifteen nays.

"*Resolved*, That the proprietors of St. Peter's Church, in parish meeting assembled, feel constrained to express their opinion and conviction that the interests of the parish will be best subserved by a termination of the connection between them and their present Rector.

"*Resolved*, That the clerk cause a copy of these resolutions to be sent to Rev. Mr. Pickman, and that when this meeting adjourn, it adjourn to meet at this place on Monday evening next, 7½ o'clock P. M."

To this the Rector replied, that were he "to accede to their resolution, he would go from them with an utterly ruined character;" that while he had been assailed by public slander with a grossness, a pertinacity, and a malignity which falls to the lot of few men, they had refused as a body to bring any charges against him, by meeting which he could defend himself, and that in short he felt constrained to express his 'opinion and conviction' that the interests of the parish and the interests of the Rector would be materially injured by a termination of the connection existing between them at present."

At a subsequent meeting of the "proprietors," the following resolution was passed by a vote of thirty-seven to eight.

"*Resolved*, That for the purpose of bringing back harmony to the parish, and wholly disclaiming any intention of imputing to the Rector any wrong, the proprietors hereby reiterate their opinion as to the expediency and necessity of such dissolution, and most respectfully and earnestly request their Rector, the Rev. William Rawlins Pickman, to resign his charge of this parish."

The Rector declining to follow the advice of these gentlemen, at a subsequent meeting, by a vote of thirty-seven to nine, they declared the pastoral relation dissolved, and appointed a committee "to apply at once to the Bishop for his concurrence in such dissolution."

The application having been made, the Bishop replied to the chairman of the committee as follows:

Boston, *May* 10, 1865.

My Dear Sir:—I have received from you a copy of certain proceedings of the proprietors of St Peter's Church, Salem,

including a resolution which was passed, dissolving the pastoral relations between the parish and its Rector, and appointing a committee to ask for my concurrence in such dissolution. You also, on behalf of said committee, request me to indicate the time, place, and mode in which it will please me to meet the committee, and hear their views on the subject.

Having already heard statements from two gentlemen of St. Peter's, in a recent visit which they made to me, and also stated my views to them, I do not perceive the necessity of a personal conference with the committee. In one of the resolutions passed on May 1st, the proprietors declare that, in one resolution adopted in the annual Easter meeting, they had "no purpose of casting any imputation upon the character of their Rector in any of his relations as a man, a clergyman or a Christian;" and in the other resolution they wholly disclaim "any intention of imputing to the Rector any wrong."

This being the statement of the proprietors in regard to the Rev. Mr. Pickman, *I feel that I should do a great act of injustice to him*, by concurring with the action of the proprietors. I therefore decline so doing.

I am very respectfully, yours,

MANTON EASTBURN.

JOHN KILBURN.

APPENDIX "J."

CANON IV.

Of Differences Between Ministers and their Congregations, and of the Dissolution of a Pastoral Connection.

§ I. In case of a controversy between any Rector or Assistant Minister of any church or parish, and the vestry or congregation of such church or parish, which cannot be settled by themselves, the parties, or either of them, may make application to the Bishop of the diocese, who shall thereupon notify each of the contesting parties to furnish him with the names of three presbyters of the diocese. The Bishop shall add to them the names of three other presbyters, and the whole number shall then be reduced to five by striking off the names alternately by each of the contesting parties. Should either party refuse or neglect to name three presbyters or to strike from the list as aforesaid, the Bishop shall act for the parties so refusing or neglecting. And in all the proceedings aforesaid the vestry or congregation, as the case may be, shall be represented by some layman of their number duly selected by them for the purpose. *Provided*, That the party or parties applying as above shall first give the Bishop satisfactory assurance of compliance with whatever may be required of them as the final issue of such proceedings.

§ II. The five presbyters thus designated shall constitute a Board of Reference to consider such controversy, and if after hearing such allegations and proofs as the parties may submit, a majority of the presbyters shall be of opinion that there is no hope of a favorable termination of such controversy, and that a dissolution of the connection between such Rector or Assistant Minister and his parish or congregation

is necessary to restore the peace of th[illegible]urch, and promote its prosperity, such presbyters shall recommend to the Bishop that such minister shall be required to relinquish his connection with such church or parish, on such conditions as may appear to them proper and reasonable.

§ III. If any Rector or Assistant Minister shall refuse to comply with the recommendation of the Bishop and presbyters, the Bishop shall proceed to forbid him the exercise of any ministerial functions within the diocese until he shall retract his refusal, or if the vestry or congregation shall refuse to comply with any such recommendation, they shall not be allowed any representation in the Diocesan Convention until they shall have retracted their refusal.

§ IV. When there is no Bishop, the President of the Standing Committee of the diocese shall perform all the duties herein allotted to the Bishop; *provided* that he shall not exercise any power under the preceding third section without the aid and consent of some Bishop of this Church.

§ V. The preceding sections of this canon shall not be obligatory upon any diocese which has made, or shall hereafter make, provision by canon, upon this subject.

§ VI. In case a minister, who has been regularly instituted and settled in a parish or church, be dismissed by such parish or church without the concurrrence of the Ecclesiastical Authority of the diocese, the vestry or congregation of such parish or church shall have no right to a representation in the Convention of the Diocese until they have made such satisfaction as the Convention may require. But the minister thus dismissed shall retain his right to a seat in the Convention, subject to the approval of the Ecclesiastical Authority of the diocese. And no minister shall leave his congregation against their will, without the concurrence of the Ecclesiastical Authority aforesaid; and if he shall leave

them without such concurrence, he shall not be allowed to take his seat in any Convention of this Church, or be eligible into any church or parish until he shall have made such satisfaction as the Ecclesiastical Authority of the diocese may require; but the vestry or congregation of such parish or church shall not be thereby deprived of its right to a representation in the Convention of the diocese.

§ VII. In case of the regular and canonical dissolution of the connection between a minister and his congregation, the Bishop, or if there be no Bishop, the Standing Committee, shall direct the Secretary of the Convention to record the same. But if the dissolution of the connection between a minister and his congregation be not regular or canonical, the Bishop or Standing Committee shall lay the same before the Convention of the diocese, in order that the above-mentioned penalties may take effect.

§ VIII. This canon shall not be obligatory in those dioceses with whose canon laws or charter it may interfere.